

## MINUTES OF TTF CG MEETING

To: Distribution

From: Bob Hunnicutt, Tower Coordinator, Columbia Telecommunications

A meeting of the Telecommunications Transmission Facility Coordinating Group (TTF CG) was held on September 11, 2002. The following people were in attendance:

### MEMBERS

Michael Ma M-NCPPC (301) 495-4595

Pat Hanehan MCPS (301) 279-3609

Helen Xu DIST (240) 777-2804

Eric Carzon OMB (240) 777-2763

Dave Niblock DPS (240) 777-6252

Rey Junquera DPWT (240) 777-6086

### STAFF

Amy Rowan OCA (240) 777-3684

Margie Williams OCA (240) 777-3762

Robert Hunnicutt CTC (410) 964-5700

Kamal Johari CTC (410) 964-5700

### OTHER ATTENDEES

Steve Weber VoiceStream Wireless

Christopher Milotich Cingular Wireless

Richard Blood VoiceStream Wireless

Sean Hughes Nextel Communications (410) 953-7439

David Primeau Sprint PCS (301) 564-1827

Janet Brown Jackson & Campbell

Jim Michal Jackson & Campbell

M.G. Diamond for Verizon Wireless

Tim Boyce Sprint PCS

Erick Ellis Nextel Communications

Tom Carroll Cole, Raywid for AT&T Wireless

Bill Landfair M-NCPPC

Henri Komlan Edoh Sprint PCS

Discussion Item - Meeting Chair: Amy Rowan announced that Jane Lawton would not be able to attend today's meeting and that she would chair the meeting in her absence.

Discussion Item - Approval of July 31, 2002 minutes: It was noted that the minutes had previously been approved via proxy, with no corrections.

Action: Consent Agenda Item:

1. AT&T Wireless application to attach 6 panel antennas at the 150' level of an existing 250' County lattice tower located at 19200 Jerusalem Road in Poolesville (Application #200206-05).

2. Verizon Wireless application to attach 12 antennas at the 141' level of an existing 148' PEPCO transmission line tower #660-S located at Deborah Drive & Killeen Way in Potomac (Application #200207-01).

3. Nextel Communications application to attach 12 antennas to the penthouse roof at the 58' of the Crossroads Building located at 7676 New Hampshire Avenue in Silver Spring (Application #200208-01).

4. VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6 existing antennas with 6 new antennas on the Rock Creek Terrace Apartment building located at 12630 Veirs Mill Road in Silver Spring (Application #200208-03).

5. VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6 existing antennas with 6 new antennas on the Bell Atlantic Building located at 13100 Columbia Pike in Silver Spring (Application #200208-04).

6. VoiceStream Wireless application to replace 6 existing antennas with 6 new antennas, and adding one GPS antenna for the E-911 system on the Summit Hills Apartment building located at 8484 - 16th Street in Silver Spring (Application #200208-05).

Pat Hanehan stated he did not want to pull Item #1 for discussion, but asked if this application would have to go through Mandatory Referral. Bob Hunnicutt replied that he did not believe it would because it was a simple attachment to an existing structure. Michael Ma concurred.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved all items on the consent agenda be recommended. Rey Junquera seconded the motion and Items 2-6 were unanimously approved, and Item 1 was approved with Pat Hanehan abstaining.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 193' monopole on the Beall Farm property located at 13201 Lewisdale Road in Clarksburg (Application #200201-01).

Bob Hunnicutt noted that this was an unusually complicated and lengthy review, partly because the siting was quite controversial. He said he would try to briefly summarize the Tower Coordinator's recommendation.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that he began receiving calls from residents about this siting in November 2001, and that the Special Exception was filed in October 2001. He noted that the Tower Coordinator received the TTFCG application in January 2002. He added that many of the residents he spoke with objected to the monopole, and soon after receiving the application, residents requested he meet with them, the property owner, and Sprint representatives at the site to discuss the proposed siting and alternatives.

Mr. Hunnicutt explained that the Special Exception plans initially proposed a 190' monopole with a typical triangular platform array of antennas. He said that by the time of the meeting with the residents, Sprint had changed its proposal to a 150' monopole with a flush mount antenna design using only three antennas. Some of the residents in attendance at that meeting asked Sprint if they would consider another site on an adjacent parcel also owned by the Beall family. Sprint agreed to consider that site, but noted that since that location has a lower ground elevation, it would most likely result in the need for a monopole taller than the 150' height currently proposed.

Mr. Hunnicutt stated that Sprint ultimately decided to revise its application and locate the monopole at the parcel along Lewisdale Road, as requested by the residents, but as a 193' monopole. This is the application that is being reviewed today.

He added that there is a second group of residents who oppose the monopole at the new Lewisdale Road location. He asked Kamal Johari to review the technical aspects of this application.

Mr. Johari stated that he had reviewed the RF propagation maps and drive test results submitted by Sprint for both the original location and the present location, and at multiple elevations. He stated that there was a need for antennas in this area to meet Sprint's coverage objectives and that the 190' height at the present location was needed to obtain the coverage desired by Sprint. He added that even with antennas at the higher elevation, this new location did not provide as good coverage as with a 150' monopole at the original site proposed. He noted that based on his review of the RF information provided by Sprint, it appeared that the coverage obtained by the 193' monopole was roughly equivalent to coverage provided by a monopole of only 120' at the original site, which is 30' less than the height proposed at the original site. He said he based his conclusion on the RF maps and drive test results submitted by the carrier. He noted that the areas to the east along Clarksburg Road showed reduced coverage due to changes from the original 150' monopole proposed.

Mr. Hunnicutt added that the Tower Coordinator had also asked Sprint to consider replacing two Allegheny wooden utility poles in the area. He stated that review of the RF maps for a 90' replacement pole showed the coverage was inadequate to meet Sprint's service objectives. He stated that the tower database was also reviewed, and he found that at least two other carriers indicated an interest in providing future service to this area, although not in close proximity to the proposed site. He recalled that one carrier showed a search ring approximately 2 miles from this site, and another had a search ring approximately 1-1/2 miles away.

Eric Carzon said he thought it was important for the record to reflect that the Tower Coordinator's review indicated that coverage from the original site at 120' was an option which the residents had not considered. He stated that since that coverage appeared to be equivalent to that of a much taller monopole at the new location, it might be a viable alternative that the Planning Board or Board of Appeals may want to pursue, depending upon public comment during the hearings for this application. He added it was also important to note that the best venue for public comment and consideration of the aesthetic aspects of tower placement are at the Planning Board, since the TTF CG's mandate for review is much narrower. Citizen concerns for aesthetic and other impacts are most effectively advocated for at the Planning Board.

Mr. Hunnicutt agreed, and stated that since this siting was so controversial, he wanted to make the TTF CG members aware of resident objections as a comment on the impact to the surrounding area, but stated that the TTF CG review focused on the technical aspects of the application. He added that the application being considered was for a 193' monopole at the Lewisdale Road address.

In response to questions about the flush mount design of the antennas, Mr. Hunnicutt stated that based on the information submitted by Sprint, he believed the structure was designed to only accommodate additional antennas attached in a similar manner. The Sprint engineer stated that it may be possible for additional carriers to attach antennas in a typical triangular array with 9 antennas if they were located below the concealed antennas.

In response to a member's suggestion to condition the recommendation on any subsequent carriers also using the low-profile, flush mount antenna design and appearance, Jim Michal replied that he believed any such limitations on the Special Exception would be the purview of the Board of Appeals and not of the TTF CG, and he would like that point reflected in the meeting minutes.

Amy Rowan asked if another TTF CG review would be required if the Planning Board wanted to approve a monopole different from what was recommended, such as at 120' at the original location. Mr. Hunnicutt replied that the Planning Board had previously asked the TTF CG to revisit an application for further comment on some technical aspects of the application, so he supposed that could be done in this case. He added that he did not see the need for a second review on this particular issue, since they have already reviewed the 120' option at the original site and commented on that matter in the Tower Coordinator's recommendation.

Eric Carzon agreed, and stated the group had already commented on the height and coverage issues related to a 120' monopole at the original site and a 193' monopole at the new site. Mr. Carzon also noted that since there were no community members present at today's meeting, he wanted to be sure the record clearly reflected their discussion on this application. He said it should be noted that the carrier had provided adequate proof that coverage was needed in the area, and that future co-location on this monopole was a possibility based on a review of the TTF CG database. Mr. Hunnicutt agreed that was true, but noted that the low-profile flush mount design of this monopole, if maintained for co-locators, may make this particular monopole less attractive to other carriers as one which could not support a full array of antennas.

Mr. Carzon stated it was important to note that the analysis of alternatives resulted in what he believed was a reasonable compromise for this site on Lewisdale Road to accommodate resident requests and the applicant's coverage requirements.

Pat Hanehan asked Mr. Michal whether Sprint preferred the original site at 120' or the proposed site at 193'. Mr. Michal stated that Sprint had gone to considerable effort and expense to consider a number of alternatives, and Sprint preferred the present location at 193 feet.

Eric Carzon reiterated his thought that it was important for the Planning Board to know that there was an alternative of 120' at the original site that the residents did not have an opportunity to consider that as an option.

Motion: Dave Niblock moved the application be recommended, and asked to include the points raised by Eric Carzon in the recommendation. Eric Carzon seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Action Item: Sprint PCS application to construct a new 134' monopole on the Emmanuel Church property located at 2311 Norbeck Road in Silver Spring (Application #200208-02).

Kamal Johari summarized the application. He noted that it appeared as though it would be difficult to see this monopole from Norbeck Road because of the tall trees surrounding the site. He stated that since the trees were approximately 70 - 90' tall, the monopole would have to be approximately 130' tall in order to place the antennas higher than the tree line to obtain Sprint's desired coverage. He added that there were some homes directly across from the site and also farther away in the surrounding community that would see the top of the monopole and the flag.

Eric Carzon commented on the issue of raising and lowering the flag, and asked the carrier who would be responsible for the flag. He commented that if the flag was left up at night, it would need to be lighted. The Sprint engineer replied that those issues would be addressed in the lease with the landowner, and the landowner would be required to raise and lower the flag. Mr. Michal added that Sprint did have a lease with the landowner for this site.

Amy Rowan noted that she thought it was very unusual to have such a large flagpole in a residential area surrounded by trees. Jim Michal stated that flagpoles are not regulated in Montgomery County and he suggested that Dave Niblock would agree with that fact. Dave Niblock replied that this was not a flagpole, and that he had already discussed this matter with Mr. Michal and he reiterated that Permitting Services considered this structure a monopole.

Eric Carzon stated he believed it would be appropriate for the Planning Board to be made aware of the flag issue in order to address it in their review. Michael Ma replied that he believed that the flag issue was a land use matter and should be reviewed by the Board of Appeals and Planning Board.

Motion: Eric Carzon moved the application be recommended, and asked to include the group's discussion about the proper display of the flag. Pat Hanehan seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Discussion Item - Legislative Update: Amy Rowan noted that the Executive Regulation was still pending. Margie Williams added that the resolution and rates adopted by the Council would go into effect on November 6, 2002. She stated that the County Executive was reviewing the Executive Regulation and that there may be recommendations for changes to the fees, but they had not yet been issued. She noted that the zoning text amendment hearing before the PHED Committee which was scheduled for September 12 had been re-scheduled for September 30, 2002. Eric Carzon noted that when the Executive Regulations are transmitted by the County Executive to the Council, there would be an additional period of time allowed for public comment before they went into effect. He also noted that he thought the height limitations on monopoles was still part of the zoning text amendment, and wanted to bring that to the attention of the carriers.

The next meeting of the TTFCG is scheduled for Wednesday, October 9, 2002 at 2:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor conference room #225 of the COB.